

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. Additionally, in order to overcome the objection to the drawings in item 7 on page 3 of the Office Action, the specification has been amended to include descriptions of S3, as illustrated in figure 7, and S13 and S20, as illustrated in figure 8.

The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

II. Amendment to the Drawings

As mentioned above, a proposed drawing amendment is submitted herewith under a separate cover letter.

Specifically, figure 2 has been amended to be identified as prior art, as requested in item 6 on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

This drawing amendment is editorial in nature and does not add new matter to the application.

III. Informalities

Claim 28 was objected to in view of various informalities identified in item 5 on page 2 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully submitted, since claim 28 has been amended to resolve the problems identified by the Examiner.

IV. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 21 and 30 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, independent claims 19 and 28 have been amended to recite the limitations of cancelled claims 21 and 30, respectively, to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 19, 20, 22-29 and 31-36 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 19, 20, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens (U.S. 2003/0048174). In addition, claims 21-27 and 30-36 were rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of various combinations of Chou (U.S. 5,892,906) and Karasawa (U.S. 4,786,900). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 19 and 28 and claims 20, 22-27, 29 and 31-36 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 19 recites a security system including a first apparatus and a second apparatus connected to the first apparatus. In addition, claim 19 recites that the second apparatus includes a second storage device previously storing a password and recites that the first apparatus includes a first storage device previously storing the password. Further, claim 19 recites that the first apparatus includes a control device (i) requesting the second apparatus to transmit the password stored in the second storage device, (ii) receiving (from the second apparatus) the password stored in the second storage device, (iii) comparing the password received from the second apparatus with the password stored in the first storage device, (iv), when the previously stored password received from the second apparatus does not coincide with the password previously stored in the first storage device, the control device displays, on a display device, a request for a user to input the password via a input device, and the control device compares the password inputted by the user with the password stored in the first storage device, and (v), when the password inputted by the user coincides with the password stored in the first storage device, the control device starts an operation of the first apparatus.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Stevens fails to disclose or suggest above-mentioned limitations (iv) and (v) of claim 21, as now recited in amended independent claim 19. In light of the above, this rejection relies on Chou for teaching the above-mentioned features, now recited in claim 19, which are admittedly lacking from Stevens.

However, Chou merely teaches that a user is prompted to enter a password, and if the entered password is incorrect, an emergency mode begins, wherein the user, instead of entering the password, enters an encrypted signature that is decrypted and compared to a serial number of a computer (see Fig. 10, steps 118-124; and col. 9, lines 25-39, as cited in the Office Action).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Chou teaches that a user is prompted to enter a password, such that, if the password is incorrect, the user, instead of entering the password, enters an encrypted signature, but fails to disclose or suggest that, (iv) when the previously stored password received from the second apparatus does not coincide with the password previously stored in the first storage device, the control device displays, on a display device, a request for a user to input the password via a input device, and the control device compares the inputted password with the password previously stored in the first storage device, and, (v) when the inputted password coincides with the password previously stored in the first storage device, the control device starts an operation of the first apparatus, as required by claim 19.

In other words, even though Chou teaches entering an encrypted signature instead of entering the password, if the inputted password is incorrect, Chou still fails to disclose or suggest that, when two previously stored passwords do not coincide, requesting the user to input the password, such that the operation of the first apparatus starts when the inputted password matches the previously stored password, as required by claim 19.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 19 and claims 20 and 22-27 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Stevens and Chou.

A result of the structure required by claim 19 is that, when the password is erroneously transmitted from the second apparatus to the first apparatus due to noise or the like, the user can

recognize that an appropriate password was not transmitted from the second apparatus, and then the user can input the password directly into the first apparatus in order to start the operation of the first apparatus.

In light of the discussion above, Chou does not provide the above-mentioned benefits of structure required by claim 19, because Chou merely recites that, when the password entered by the user is incorrect, the user is given another opportunity to enter an encrypted digital signature. In other words, Chou does not provide the user an opportunity to recognize that an appropriate password was not transmitted from the second apparatus, so that the user can input the password directly into the first apparatus, because Chou fails to disclose or suggest that, when the previously stored password received from the second apparatus does not coincide with the password previously stored in the first storage device, the control device displays, on a display device, a request for a user to input the password via a input device, and the control device compares the inputted password with the password previously stored in the first storage device, and, when the inputted password coincides with the password previously stored in the first storage device, the control device starts an operation of the first apparatus, as required by claim 19

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Stevens and/or Chou or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stevens and/or Chou to obtain the invention of independent claim 19. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 19 and claims 20 and 22-27 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 28 is directed to an apparatus and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 19. Thus, for

the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 28 and claims 29 and 31-36 that depend therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 21-27 and 30-36, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of various combinations of Chou and Karasawa (secondary references), it is respectfully submitted that these secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 19 and 28 which are lacking from the Stevens reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Stevens with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited in independent claims 19 and 28 and claims 20, 22-27, 29 and 31-36 that depend therefrom.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Toru SASABE

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.06.15 15:15:02 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 15, 2010